



Correspondence Between Staff and Applicant

Approval Letter

Denial Letter

Public Participation - DR, PP



Public participation ensures early notification and involvement prior to the filing of a formal application, which is an integral component of Scottsdale's public hearing process.

☒ Step 1: Complete Neighborhood Involvement Outreach

☐ Hold a minimum of 1 Open House Meeting prior to formal application submittal

- x Send open house invite via 1st Class Letter to property owners & HOAs within 750', to the City's interested parties list, and to the City project coordinator. Invitations need to be sent at least 10 calendar days prior to the open house meeting, and include the following information:
 - o Project request and description
 - o Pre-application number (xx-PA-xxxx)
 - o Project location (street address)
 - o Size (e.g. Number of Acres of project, Square Footage of Lot)
 - o Zoning
 - o Applicant and City contact names, phone numbers, and email addresses
 - o Scheduled open house(s) - including time, date, and location
- x Post **Project Under Consideration** sign at least 10 calendar days prior to your Open House Meeting (See Project Under Consideration (White Sign) posting requirements)
- x E-mail open house information to the Project Coordinator and to: planninginfo@scottsdaleaz.gov
- x Provide sign-in sheets and comment sheets at the open house meeting
- x Avoid holidays, weekends, and working hours
- x Maintain contact with neighbors during the process and make as many contacts that are warranted to achieve productive neighborhood involvement
- x Hold additional open house meetings as necessary to ensure public participation

☒ Complete Neighborhood Notification Outreach

- x Mail Neighborhood Notification 1st Class Letter to property owners & HOAs within 750', the City's standard interested parties list, and to the City project coordinator at least 10 calendar days prior to formal application submittal (include the following information):
 - o Project request and description
 - o Pre-application number (xx-PA-xxxx)
 - o Project location (street address)
 - o Size (e.g. Number of Acres of project, Square Footage of Lot)
 - o Zoning
 - o Conceptual site plan/elevations
 - o Applicant and City contact names and phone numbers
 - o

☒ Step 2: Document your Project Notification efforts as follows:

- x Provide a list of names, phone numbers/addresses of contacted parties
- x Provide a map showing where notified neighbors are located
- x Provide the dates contacted, and the number of times contacted
- x Indicate how they were contacted (e.g. letter, phone call). If certified mail was used, provide receipts of delivery
- x Provide copies of letters or other means used to contact parties

Public Participation - DR, PP



- x Provide originals of all comments, letters, and correspondence received

City will post public hearing sign notices and provide other public notification

- x Mailing out postcards to property owners within 750 feet
- x Posting case information on the City website
- x Posting on social media
- x Sending to email subscribers



319 N. Main, Suite 200
Springfield, Missouri 65806



(417) 865-6100



www.brparc.com

November 27, 2019

Greg Bloemberg
Senior Planner
Current Planning
City of Scottsdale

Re: Cavasson Hilton Hotel - Scottsdale, Arizona
Pre-Application Number: 517-PA-19
Part I, Item 14 – Public Participation Process – DR,PP

Dear Greg,

Plans details of site have been Coordinated with only property owner with in 750' of Site.
That Property owner is:

The State of Arizona
Office of Land Management.
% Mark Edelman
1616 W Adams Street
Phoenix AZ 85007



319 N. Main, Suite 200
Springfield, Missouri 65806



(417) 521-6100



www.brparc.com

April 2, 2020

Mr. Greg Bloemberg
Senior Planner
City of Scottsdale
7447 E Indian School Rd.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Re: 5-DR-2020
Cavasson Hilton Hotel
Key Code: 3801D

Dear Greg,

We are in receipt of the comments received on February 26, 2020 regarding the 1st Review Comments on the 1st submission of the Design Review. Please see the comments below, the design team's responses in red, along with the required documents requested. Please accept this response as the 2nd Design Review submittal for the above referenced project.

Drainage:

1. The preliminary drainage report has not been accepted. Please refer to the redlined report and grading & drainage plan in the internet folder and revise accordingly.

See the attached revised Drainage Report addressing the comments.

Water and Wastewater:

2. The preliminary Basis of Design (BOD) Reports have not been accepted. Please refer to the redlined reports in the internet folder and respond to the following:

- Explain why three separate land uses are being presented but only one (hotel) is being addressed in the Sewer Basis of Design.

See the attached revised Drainage Report addressing the comments.

Airport:

3. Please provide a signed Airport Vicinity & Airpark Development Guidelines & Checklist (Short Form) with the next submittal. Click on the following link to

get a copy of the form. <https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/planning-development/forms>

See the attached Airport Vicinity & Airpark Development Guidelines & Checklist (Short Form).

Building Elevation Design:

4. In an effort to promote “four-sided” architecture, and provide a measure of solar protection, please revise the elevations as needed to incorporate exaggerated eaves overall all window banks, similar to the bank of windows on the west-facing elevation. Refer to Sensitive Design Principle 9 and the Architecture section of the Commercial Design Guidelines.

See the attached exterior views identifying the solar shading measures implemented beyond the face of the glazing. Per the City of Scottsdale's request, we explored increasing the depth of the overhangs as well as adding horizontal shading devices on the north side of the building.

In our assessment of increasing the horizontal overhangs, it was determined that the shading benefit was minimal when compared to the additional construction cost. We also assessed the addition of horizontal overhangs on the north elevation. Given the limited exposure at this elevation, it was determined that the shading benefit was minimal when compared to the additional construction cost. Additionally, our assessment suggested that increasing the depth of these horizontal overhangs may cause these shading devices to appear “tacked on, similarly to the comment 5 below regarding the balconies.

5. Protruding balconies that appear “tacked-on” are discouraged. Please revise the building elevations as needed to incorporate protruding balconies into the building design, perhaps by continuing the “fin wall” appearance utilized on the east elevation. Refer to the Architecture section of the Commercial Design Guidelines.

Per our discussions with the City of Scottsdale, it was noted that these balconies that protrude from the building at the northeast corener and the southwest corner will also serve as shading devices as requested in comment 4 of the review comments. For these to be accessible balconies and to meet the Hilton requirements, these balconies must be 5'-0" deep from the face of the building. Additionally, please note that while these balconies appear more solid in the drawings, the railings will be all glass to promote visibility and for the balconies to appear as a thin horizontal projection similar to the shading devices.

Lighting Design:

6. Please provide an enlarged cross-section mounting detail for the proposed "TL1" fixture (for both the overhang and balconies), confirming the light source will be completely concealed from off-site view. Refer to the Architecture section of the Commercial Design Guidelines.

Based on our discussion with the City of Scottsdale, the flashing shield on this fixture has been extended to further shield the fixture. The dimension for this shield has been given on the details included in the attached drawings. The TL1 fixtures at the guestroom balconies have been omitted.

7. Please reduce the number of proposed "live wall flood light" fixtures over the living wall on the west elevation. Lighting that results in a solid wall wash of a large area is discouraged. Refer to the Architecture section of the Commercial Design Guidelines.

See the attached revised elevations and electrical drawings reflecting the reduction of "live wall flood light" fixtures over the living wall on the west elevation.

8. Please revise the lighting site plan and photometric analysis to identify the location of each lighting fixture type (by number/letter identification). Refer to the Plan and Report Requirements for Development Applications (PRRDA).

See the attached revised lighting site plan and photometric analysis to identifying the locations of each lighting fixture type.

9. Please revise the photometric analysis to include the average and maximum foot candle (FC) output for the site, and the foot candle output at the property lines. Refer to the PRRDA. NOTE: Some areas indicate FC measurements that appear to be rather excessive. Maximum FC output for this area is typically 8.0. An exception can be made for areas covered by an overhang, i.e. the 6th floor patio area. Refer to Sections 2-1.208 and 2-1.209 of the DSPM.

See the attached revised photometric analysis reflecting the average and maximum foot candle (FC) output for the site as well as the foot candle output at the property lines. The lighting has been revised to demonstrate a maximum foot candle (FC) output of 8.0.

10. Please confirm the proposed "SL1" string light fixture will include caps for each fixture to focus light downward toward the areas intended to be illuminated. Refer to Section 2-1.208 of the DSPM and the Architecture section of the Commercial Design Guidelines.

The proposed "SL1" string light fixture will include caps for each fixture to focus light downward toward the areas intended to be illuminated

Circulation:

11. Please provide a minimum 6-foot wide pedestrian connection from the hotel site to the Hayden/Cavasson intersection. Refer to Section 2-1.310 of the DSPM.

As discussed with the City of Scottsdale, the sidewalk will be 5'-0" +/- along the planter at the west side of the building and then expands to 6'-0" minimum to the north and south of the planter. See the attached revised civil and landscaping drawings.

Circulation:

12. Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to address the following:

- Internal mid-block crosswalks should be raised or enhanced.

Unit pavers will be provided at the mid-block crosswalks. See the attached revised hardscape plans.

- The porte-cochere should be better delineated, so vehicles are not entering/exiting along the internal private driveway.

Unit pavers will be provided at the porte cochere drop off along with concrete edging to better delineate the drop off from the internal private drive. See the attached revised hardscape plans.

- Enhanced crosswalks in the public right-of-way should utilize stamped asphalt as opposed to pavers.

Unit pavers are preferred at the crosswalks. See the attached revised hardscape plans.

- Masonry walls must be located outside required sight triangles.

The masonry walls are not within the site triangles. See the attached site drawings showing that the site triangles do not conflict with the masonry walls.

- An area for "retail bike parking" is identified on the site plan but no racks are shown. Please revise accordingly.

See the attached Cavasson Phase 1 Masterplan Bike Rack Exhibit.

Landscaping:

13. Based on the mature size of the proposed plants, please modify the planting density and layout so that it is representative of the mature size of the proposed species, relative to the planting area. In general, a twenty to thirty percent (20 - 30%) reduction of planting intensity should be implemented in order to avoid overcrowding of plants and excessive trimming or shearing of plants, resulting in more sustainable landscape improvements. Refer to Zoning Ordinance Sections 10.100 and 10.700.

The planting plans have been revised to reduce the total quantity of plants from 3,029 to 2,504, representing a 17% reduction. We've strategically increased the spacing in some areas, maintained hedges in areas where privacy and screening are necessary, kept shrubs at the building perimeter to soften the elevations, and found a few rows of plants here and there to delete without compromising our overall concept for the project. We feel this reduction is a fair compromise reduction, any more trimming may compromise the design concept and create bare areas. All plant symbols show fully grown plant.

Site Design

14. Please revise site plan and landscape plans to eliminate the internal floor plans, leaving just the building footprint. Too much information makes plans harder to review/interpret. Refer to the PRRDA.

See the attached revised site and landscaping plans reflecting this request.

Sincerely,

B R P Architects

Christopher M. Swan, AIA
Architect & Managing Partner

:CMS
Attachments

MR. GREG BLOEMBERG

CITY OF SCOTTSDALE – THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION
90E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE GILBERT, ARIZONA 85296

RE:

PROJECT: CAVASSON HILTON HOTEL (CASE NUMBER 5-DR-2020)

ADDRESS: N HAYDEN RD, SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85255

Dear Mr. Greg Bloemberg:

The following are responses to the Cavasson Hilton Hotel (Case Number 5-DRB-2020) landscape plan comments from the Town of Gilbert Building Department.

CIRCULATION:

11. Please provide a minimum 6-foot wide pedestrian connection from the hotel site to the Hayden/Cavasson intersection. Refer to Section 2-1.310 of the DSPM.

Sidewalk width updated to 6'-0" on north and south ends of proposed landscape planter. Sidewalk to remain 5'-0" along landscape planter length.

12. Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to address the following:

- Internal mid-block crosswalks should be raised or enhanced.

Internal midblock crosswalk to be pavers per civil plans.

- The porte-cochere should be better delineated, so vehicles are not entering/exiting along the internal private driveway.

Port-cochere to be delineated by pavers per civil plans.

- Enhanced crosswalks in the public right-of-way should utilize stamped asphalt as opposed to pavers.

Enhanced crosswalk to remain pavers to match proposed paving along Cavasson Boulevard.

- Masonry walls must be located outside required sight triangles.

All wall shown out of sight triangles.

- An area for "retail bike parking" is identified on the site plan but no racks are shown. Please revise accordingly.

Bike parking are added to landscape plans.

LANDSCAPING:

13. Based on the mature size of the proposed plants, please modify the planting density and layout so that it is representative of the mature size of the proposed species, relative to the planting area. In general, a twenty to thirty percent (20 - 30%) reduction of planting intensity should be implemented in order to avoid overcrowding of plants and excessive trimming or shearing of plants, resulting in more sustainable landscape improvements. Refer to Zoning Ordinance Sections 10.100 and 10.700.

Overall landscape planting reduced. Planting density and symbols updated to reflect mature size.

SITE DESIGN:

14. Please revise site plan and landscape plans to eliminate the internal floor plans, leaving just the building footprint. Too much information makes plans harder to review/interpret. Refer to the PRRDA.

Landscape plans updated to reflect building footprint only.

April 1, 2020

City of Scottsdale
Greg Bloemberg
Planning and Development

RE: Hilton Scottsdale North at Cavasson – 5-DR-2020
1st DRB Review – Responses on Civil Engineering Document Comments

Civil Related Comments on within Letter

Drainage

1. Comment: See redlined report and Grading and Drainage Plans for comments
Response: Comment responses for plan and report provided below. Plans have been updated for comments as requested.

Water and Wastewater

2. Comment: Explain why three separate land uses are being presented but only one hotel is being addressed in the Sewer Basis of Design.
Response: This was done in error and we have removed the land use types that are not included with the hotel project
3. Comment: More explanation is needed about.... Only covering the hotel (Made in redlined Report)
Response: This sewer report only covers the hotel, The vicinity map has been corrected to only show the hotel site as the limits of this project. All discussion of the existing Phase 1 sewer system is provided in order to give context to the service connection for the hotel.

Drainage Report:

4. Comment: Consider using main report as a reference and develop site specific narrative/memorandum. Please address EHS and scour depth comments from civil plan in this report.
Response: The report has been updated in order to demonstrate that it is specifically for the hotel site by replacing the vicinity map with the hotel vicinity map. A new section has been added to the report called Erosion Hazard Setback where we addressed the EHS and scour depth comments from the civil plans. The erosion hazard setback was calculated using the level 1 approach for straight reaches and curved reaches. The setback was calculated as 18.8 feet for curved reaches and 7.5 feet on straight reaches. Both of these setbacks are less than the minimum required by Maricopa County so the minimum allowable setback of 20 feet was used instead.
5. Comment: Add note with contour source/reference
Response: The note has been added that states the date of the contours is August 8th, 2018 and that the contours were obtained through aerial topography performed by Cooper Aerial Surveys Co.

Comments on Grading and Drainage Plans:

6. Comment: Add engineer's certification (Sheet C101)
Response: Plans revised as requested.
7. Comment: Add HAG and RFD (Sheet 203)
Response: The HAG and RFD has been added to the sections

8. Comment: Based on plan view, it appears that the wash flowing against proposed wall. Please review and update as needed. Depict lateral erosion hazard setback limits. (Sheet 203)

Response: Section updated, there are some areas where there is some 4:1 side slope to the bottom of the channel so it will not be universal that the high water will be against the retaining wall. In the sections a 20' Erosion Hazard Setback has been added as requested.

9. Comment: Add Flow Arrow and Q100 (Sheet 301)

Response: The comment appears 3 times and all Q's have been added to pipes per redlines.

10. Comment: Review and update rip-rap limits (Sheet 301)

Response: Rip Rap limits updated. It should be noted that NRI has broken out the channel and monument/retaining walls under a separate permit. The City of Scottsdale tracking number is 346-PA-2002 and a DRB submittal will be made roughly concurrent to the 2nd Hotel submittal. All channel information is duplicated in the attached submittal to show on the two projects interact.

11. Comment: Add Section (Sheet 301)

Response: Section has been added to Sheet 203.

12. Comment: Depict D.E. Limits Proposed Wall appears to be located in D.E. (Sheet 301)

Response: Wall will encroach into existing D.E. New D.E. limits have been shown on the face of the wall. Map of Dedication is currently being prepared for additional easements and changes within the Phase 1 development. This easement will need to be added and the old one abandoned.

13. Comment: Add Call Out (Sheet C302)

Response: This area is a ADA walk way and is not part of the drainage plan, a keynote for the construction is shown on sheet C102. There are grades and slopes shown of the ADA compliance.

14. Comment: Depict and show wash (Sheet C302)

Response: Wash contours added to background.

15. Comment: Add Flow Arrow and Q100 (Sheet 302)

Response: Q has been added to pipe per redlines.

16. Comment: Add Callout (Sheet 302)

Response: The background element is a surface landscape pot and has been removed from the background.

17. Comment: Depict Surface overflow for proposed catch basins. Identify max ponding depth (Sheet 302)

Response: Exhibit 4, Inundation Map, which has been added to the drainage report to identify the limits. This is the document we completed for Phase 1. It should be noted that there are more grates than are required for storm events, many times we calculated flow for a drainage area using 1 grate, the grate used for the Drainage Report calculations will show the limits of ponding since that grate is relevant to verifying the areas do not overtop. This hotel has many more drainage inlets than is required but this is due to the nature of all the very small areas we want to keep water from ponding within during rain events.

Greg Brown
Project Manager
gbrown@hubbardengineering.com
480-398-3826